



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,207	01/04/2002	Martin L. Plumer	S01.12-0846/STL 10285	2028
•	7590 10/06/2003		EXAMINER	
Brian D. K		*	EVANS, JEFFERSON A	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY International Centre - Suite 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , , , , , , ,	econd Avenue	2652		
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

1

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	T		
<i>\$</i>	•	10/039,207	PLUMER ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	-	Jefferson Evans	2652			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period fo	or Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v ire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a)□		— is action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matters, pr				
Disposit	ion of Claims					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,6,9,12-16,19 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
•	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,17,18,20,22 and 23</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
,	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
	ion Papers	_				
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine		w the Everiner			
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2002</u> is/are:					
11)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the The proposed drawing correction filed on					
117	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		vod by the Examiner.			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•				
, —	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		•			
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	o priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(a	)-(d) or (f)			
,—	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
۳)	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu	rity documents have been receive				
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		d.			
14)⊠ <i>A</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).			
	) $\square$ The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest					
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notic	se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
	11.00					

Application/Control Number: 10/039,207

Art Unit: 2652

Claims 1 to 23 are pending.

### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species One, figure 4, in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. Applicant says claims 1-5, 7-11, 17, 18, and 20-23 read on Species One. The Examiner agrees with the exceptions of claims 3, 9, and 21 which are drawn to the double pancake coil embodiment of Species Three. The Examiner notes that it would have been more accurate if he had set forth that there were four species: the pole structure of figure 4 with a helical coil structure, the pole structure of figure 5 with a helical coil structure, the pole structure of figure 4 with a double pancake coil structure, the pole structure of figure 5 with a double pancake coil structure. Elected Species One corresponds to figure 4 with a helical coil structure.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12-16, 19, and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

#### **Drawings**

2. The drawings are objected to because the drawings do not adequately depict the nature of the flux flow in figures 4 and 5. The important issue is how the flux interacts with the magnetic medium and this is not clear from figures 4 and 5. It is also noted that an overall flux flow should be depicted to provide adequate understanding of how the invention operates and is distinguished from the prior art. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the

Art Unit: 2652

drawings will not be held in abeyance. Applicatant is reminded of the prohibition against the entry of new matter.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Figures 4 has one arrow showing flux flow and figure 5 has two arrows, however this is considered to be inadequate to establish the flux interaction between a read/write element of the invention and a magnetic medium, especially as the medium is not depicted in either figure 4 or 5. Also, the overall flux flow in the system is unclear as there is neither depiction or description of the overall flow. Such information is needed to show how the inventive read/write head operates and avoids unwanted fringing effects or similar such potential problems. The flux is not conducted to a back gap via a return pole, but where does it go instead? How is flux prevented from interacting with the MR element shields in such a manner that one or both shields acts as a return path?

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/039,207

Art Unit: 2652

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (U.S. 6,128,166). Note figure 7.
Tanaka discloses a single write pole 26 separated from a write coil 27 by an insulating material, and a MR element 24 between shield layers 23.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 2, 8, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al in view of Cohen et al (U.S. 5,703,740). Tanaka does not disclose a helical coil arrangement.

Cohen discloses a helical coil arrangement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the coil of Tanaka et al take on a helical arrangement. The motivation would have been: such a coil arrangement was an effective manner in which to provide an increased number of turns and to increase efficiency.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jefferson Evans whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 10/039,207

Art Unit: 2652

703-308-1610. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Nguyen can be reached on 703-305-9687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

1AF

September 26, 2003

Jefferson Evans Primary Examiner Art Unit 2652

JEFFERSON EVANS PRIMARY EXAMINER